REMARKS

I.   **INTRODUCTION**

Claims 5, 22, and 33 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 6, lines 25-28 of the originally filed specification. Thus, claims 3-6, 12, 22-24, 30, 32-34, and 36-39 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendments since no additional limitations are included in the claims. The limitations were previously presented in the claims and presumably examined by the Examiner. Thus, the amendments should not require an additional search.

II.   **THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 3-6, 12, 23-24, 30, 33, 34, and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,450) in view of Zanen (U.S. Patent No. 5,532,777) and further in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 4,751,570) and Cox (U.S. Patent No. 5,383,013).

Claim 5, as amended, recites, inter alia, "recognition means for analyzing stereo image data from the camera to locate an object of interest in a field of view of the camera and to determine a distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and a size of the object of interest, *wherein said analysis of the stereo image data includes extracting multiple features from each image and matching the multiple features across different views; and adjusting means for automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on the analysis of the stereo image data*, the adjusting means comprising: angle adjustment means for adjusting the angle of the set of mirrors relative to the centrally located plane;

distance adjustment means for adjusting the distance between the camera and the set of mirrors; and focal length adjustment means for changing a focal length of the camera."

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Suzuki fails to disclose or suggest the above-cited recitation of claim 5. Specifically, the Examiner admits that Suzuki fails to disclose the "recognition means for analyzing stereo image data from the camera to locate an object of interest in a field of view of the camera and to determine a distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and a size of the object of interest, *wherein said analysis of the stereo image data includes extracting multiple features from each image and matching the multiple features across different views*." However, the Examiner states that Suzuki discloses "adjusting means for automatically changing at least on system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on the focusing of the camera." (*See 8/18/10 Office Action*, p. 4). It seems the Examiner is using this feature of Suzuki to meet the recitation of "adjusting means for automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on the analysis of the stereo image data" in claim 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions.

Initially, Applicants note that since Suzuki does not disclose the recognition means or the analysis performed by the recognition means, as recited in claim 5, then it would be impossible for Suzuki to disclose an adjusting means "for automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest *based on the analysis of the stereo image data*." Since "the analysis of the stereo image data" refers to the analysis conducted by the recognition means, then Suzuki cannot possibly disclose an adjusting means that performs an action based on this analysis because Suzuki lacks the claimed analysis.

Furthermore, Suzuki discloses an adapter (12) which is connected to a camera. Specifically, the adapter is mounted forward of the camera's zoom lens (5) so that any movement by the zoom lens (wide or telephoto) is translated to the adapter (12). The movement of the zoom lens (5) also drives the movement of mirrors through a series of

mechanical connections. (*See Suzuki*, col. 5, ll. 35-48). The Examiner refers to Suzuki's disclosure that "the stereo base and the convergence angle are varied with variations in the focal length of the zoom lens." (*Id.* at col. 6, ll. 61-62). However, these variations are caused by mechanical connections and are completely unrelated to any analysis of the object of interest.

Zanen suffers from the same deficiencies of Suzuki. Specifically, Zanen also discloses an adapter (19) that is attached to the camera (1) and that movement of the lens (4) drives the mirrors of the adapter (19). (*See Zanen*, col. 4, ll. 50-61). It seems the Examiner is merely referring to Zanen to meet the recitation of "angle adjustment means for adjusting the angle of the set of mirrors relative to the centrally located plane." However, Applicants respectfully submit that like Suzuki, Zanen fails to disclose an analysis of the image wherein the analysis is used as a basis "for automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest" such as "*angle adjustment means for adjusting the angle of the set of mirrors relative to the centrally located plane.*"

To cure the deficiencies of Suzuki and Zanen with regards to the adjusting means "automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on the analysis of the stereo image data… wherein said analysis of the stereo image data includes extracting multiple features from each image and matching the multiple features across different views," the Examiner refers to Robinson. However, Applicants maintain the previous arguments with regards to Robinson presented in the June 3, 2010 Response, namely, that disclosure of a single laser spot by Robinson does not embody extraction of multiple features from each image and matching of the multiple features across different views, as recited in claim 5. In addition, Robinson only determines the "range to the object of principal interest." (*See Robinson*, col. 2, ll. 51-52). In contrast, claim 5, as amended, now requires the determination of both "a distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and a size of the object of interest."

Although the Examiner does not explicitly admit this deficiency, the Examiner implicitly does so by referring to Cox to meet this limitation. (*See 8/18/10 Office Action*, p. 7). Cox discloses "a computer that utilizes a novel stereo algorithm for finding a match between corresponding features in the left and right images." (*See Cox*. Col. 3, ll. 8-10). Cox uses this analysis to determine the distance of features. However, Cox is silent with regards to determining the size of an object of interest in the image.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki, Zanen, Rabinson, and Cox, alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest "recognition means for analyzing stereo image data from the camera to locate an object of interest in a field of view of the camera and to determine a distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and a size of the object of interest, wherein said analysis of the stereo image data includes extracting multiple features from each image and matching the multiple features across different views; and adjusting means for automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on the analysis of the stereo image data," as recited in claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable and that the § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 23, 24, 30, and 39 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

Claim 33 recites limitations substantially similar to those of claim 5. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons presented with regards to claim 5 and request the withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection. Because claims 34 and 36-38 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 33, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

Claims 22 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Robinson in view of Cox.

As previously stated, neither Robinson nor Cox disclose or suggest determining both "a distance of the object of interest from the video cameras and a size of the object of interest." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable and request

the withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection. Because claim 32 depends on and, therefore, contains all of the limitations of claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2010   By: /kevin c. ecker/

Kevin C. Ecker, (Reg. No. 43,600)
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618

Mail all correspondence to:
Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618